Appl. No. 10/065,293 Amdt. dated July 11, 2006 Reply to Office action of May 05, 2006

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the specification:

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 9, "Figures" should be deleted.

5 Appropriate correction is required.

## Response:

The specification has been amended to correct this informality. Acceptance of the corrected specification is respectfully requested.

10

20

25

2. Rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett et al (US 2002/0112014, hereinafter "Bennett").

## 15 Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish from Bennett. Claim 1 now recites that the cellular phone system comprises a processor connected to an Internet website which supports network chatting. The claimed method also includes sending a message from one of the plurality of cellular phones wirelessly to one of the plurality of nodes, and then sending the message from the node to the Internet website via the processor. Then, the message is sent from the Internet website to a plurality of cellular phones for distributing the message that was posted on the Internet website. In this way, the Internet website acts as a central bulletin board for messages to be posted on and read from. This amendment is fully supported in Figure 3 and paragraph [0034] of the specification, for example, and no new matter has been added through this amendment to claim 1.

On the other hand, Bennett teaches that messages such as SMS messages can be sent

5

10

15

Appl. No. 10/065,293 Amdt. dated July 11, 2006 Reply to Office action of May 05, 2006

between cellular phones on different phone networks using a central server 24. The server 24 is used for routing messages between the different phone networks.

Bennett does not teach that cellular phones connect to an Internet website that supports chatting. In paragraph 51, Bennett teaches that a form on a webpage can be used for entering SMS messages. However, Bennett does not teach that a cellular phone sends messages to a website which supports network chatting, and that the website is used for sending the messages to other cellular phones which are also connected to the website. Therefore, Bennett does not provide a way for cellular phone users to contribute to a discussion taking place on an Internet website.

Since Bennett fails to teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, claim 1 should be allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/065,293 Amdt. dated July 11, 2006 Reply to Office action of May 05, 2006

Sincerely yours,

Vinton ban	Date:	July 11, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)